

REMARKS:

Claims 1-17 are currently being examined, of which claims 1, 5, 9-11, 14, and 16 have been amended herein.

Applicants and Applicants' attorney thank Examiner Pak for the in-person interview courteously granted December 7, 2005. The special attention the Examiner paid to the instant application is noted with appreciation. Items discussed during the interview include: Office Action dated September 13, 2005; claims 1, 5, 9-11, 14, and 16; rejection of claims 1-4 and 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over USP 4,557,557 (**Gleason**) in view of USP 6,676,307 (**Yang**); and rejection of claims 5-8 and 10-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over **Gleason** in view of **Yang** and USP 6,097,426 (**Esmaeili**).

Claims 1-4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over USP 4,557,557 (**Gleason**) in view of USP 6,676,307 (**Yang**).

Claims 5-8 and 10-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over **Gleason** in view of **Yang** and USP 6,097,426 (**Esmaeili**).

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections of claims 1-17.

Gleason and Yang, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in base claim 1, as amended: "two optical fibers cojoined axially by fusion splicing following deformation of the fiber core and fiber mode field diameter (MFD), the mode field diameter (MFD) in a vicinity of each endface of the two optical fibers being controlled by said deformation, wherein the optical fixed attenuator is produced by using: calculating means for calculating the amount of deformation of the fiber core and mode field diameter (MFD) corresponding to a desired splice loss in advance of the deformation; and deformation means for deforming the fiber core and mode field diameter (MFD) in dependence upon the calculated amount to achieve the desired splice loss", in combination.

Gleason and Yang, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in base claim 9, as amended: "the amount of the arc is different from the fusion arc discharge intensity", in combination with the other claimed features.

Gleason, Yang, and Esmaeili, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in base claim 10, as amended: "the quantity of the electric discharge is different from the fusion arc discharge intensity", in combination with the other claimed features.

Gleason, Yang, and Esmaeili, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in base claim 11, as amended: "the quantity of the preheating is different from the fusion arc discharge intensity", in combination with the other claimed features.

Gleason, Yang, and Esmaeili, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in base claim 14, as amended: "the quantity of the electric discharge is different from the fusion arc discharge intensity", in combination with the other claimed features.

Gleason, Yang, and Esmaeili, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in base claim 16, as amended: "the quantity of the preheating is different from the fusion arc discharge intensity", in combination with the other claimed features.

All dependent claims depend from one or more of the above-discussed base claims 1, 5, 9-11, 14, and 16.

Thus, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1-17 should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims currently being examined are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due now or in the future with respect to this application, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



Darren R. Crew
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 37,806

DRC/llf

Atty. Docket No. **030475**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time